As the sacred River's voice whereby all Nature-sounds are echoed back, so must the heart of him "who in the stream would enter," thrill in response to every sigh and thought of all that lives and breathes.

—*The Voice of the Silence*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 60 FEBRUARY, 1972 NUMBER 4

THE FOCUS OF THE WORK

IT is often said that beings of the stature of H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge act almost entirely on the plane of causes, leaving the effects to take care of themselves. For practical illustration, there is the relation of these two to the Theosophical work in the world. Soon after the formation of the original Society in 1875, this work assumed the character of a movement. In a comparatively few years, it spread around the world. No doubt both H.P.B. and Judge gave some attention to the practical mechanisms through which this was accomplished, especially to the extent that the Society and its branches could be seen as fitting expressions of the principles of Theosophic thought, but neither of them wrote very much about "organization." Their primary concern was with the philosophy and its application in daily life. Here, one could say, was represented the plane of causes in relation to the Theosophical Movement.

In this they were like the greatest of their Predecessors. No great religious scripture is written from an institutional point of view. *The Bhagavad-Gita* is addressed to individuals. The *Upanishads* are in the language of discipleship. The Buddha spoke to all mankind. Plato engages the individual intelligence, seeking to arouse aspiration and a sense of the need for understanding. And so with all the other real teachers. They knew that with right motive and right philosophy, the work would get done.

Mr. Judge is often said to have been an organizing genius, and the astonishing growth of the Theosophical Society in the United States during his lifetime was certainly due for the most part to his efforts. Yet in his address at the Parliament of Religions at the World's Fair in 1893, he told what he believed this success should be attributed to. The spread of the T.S., he explained, was not due to some "secret fund" which made it possible for theosophists "to do work which other bodies can accomplish only by the use of money." On the contrary, he said:

> We have little money and never had much. We do not want it, do not expect it, and the day when we shall have a large fund and be able to collect $5,000,000 in imitation of Western missionary bodies will be the day when the Theosophical Society will die. It is not money that has done this. It is the energy of the human heart. These people who are here with me are only representatives of many, many persons all over the world who are willing to give their life, their energy, their time to a movement which they think will benefit man. They get nothing for it; they get no preference. What is it of honor to preside at a meeting like this? What is it for any person to be a member of a Branch? What is it to be the President of the Theosophical Society? Nothing at all. There is no honor in it whatever. There are no places, no salaries, nothing at all but work.

By work Mr. Judge meant the spread of the philosophy and obtaining a realizing sense of its meaning through application and reflection. When there was trouble, he always sought the solution in the correction of human attitudes, as a reading of his *Letters That Have Helped Me* will show. His concern was not with organization but with working for "a change in the Manas and Buddhi of the Race." And he added that while this may seem indefinite, "it is, nevertheless, very defined and very great in scope." Even his asides bear on this theme:

> What a petty lot of matter we spend time on, when so much is transitory. After a hundred years what will be the use of all this? Better that a hundred years hence a principle of freedom and an impulse of work should have been established. The small errors of a life are nothing, but the general sum of thought is much. . . . I care everything for the unsectarianism that H.P.B. died to start, and which is now threatened in its own house. . . .

As the years slip by, it becomes ever more evident that the forms of the associations of men are destined to lose their rigid and legalistic character. Everywhere, and especially in the United States, there are signs of deep and inchoate longing for unities and alliances

which are not secured by external ties, but which embody the spontaneous inclinations of feelings and the heart. This may perhaps be read as a decline of the material and an ascendancy of the plastic or psychic element in human affairs. Such tendencies contain great opportunities, since the psychic side of life, when under the governance of mind, is more responsive to higher intelligence than gross matter can ever be. But without that guidance, there is the danger of extreme polarizations such as are warned about in H.P.B.'s characterization of the present cycle. The strength that is needed, then, now and in the future, is strength of mind and in philosophy. As the rigidities of external organization fall away, in keeping with the new sense of reality that is coming into men's thought, and as a result, also, of the inutility of social forms belonging to another age, this requirement of inner strength will surely become paramount, as the only available source of stability during a period of rapid change.

We might think of the coming cycle as involving a further incarnation of Manas. If this should be the case—and statements in both *The Secret Doctrine* and *The Ocean of Theosophy* support the idea —then all human affairs will eventually be conducted with greater simplicity. This is a way of saying that intelligence and wisdom make men less bound by the external conditions of life, able to live and act with greater freedom, and with a minimum of adventitious aids. It would also amount to a change in the focus of man's sense of identity, bringing an entire range of awareness that has been largely lacking in the past. Inevitably, such a change would be marked by extensive alterations in institutional arrangements, since the intuitive grounds of all rational relationships will have become more inclusive and penetrating. Even in such areas, we have not been left without hints as to the future, in both *The Key to Theosophy* and elsewhere.

But the causes of all these beneficent changes lie hidden, relating as they do to the inner principles of man's nature and the growth in soul-knowledge with which Theosophy is concerned. Another passage in Mr. Judge's address to the Parliament of Religions throws an interesting light on all such questions. Explaining the policy of the Society, he said:

> We have been asked why we do not join the Bellamyites and other cooperative societies? If you want to go in, go in. The Theosophical Society, as such, has nothing to do with it. I am perfectly satisfied to live where I am and do my duty where I

stand, without any new law of property, or with it, whichever you please. The religion of the West which logically ought to support all the various socialists and anarchists and nihilists is the Christian religion, because in the beginning it was communal. Jesus' system was a community in which everything was common property, and the early Christians threw all their money and property into one common box. Why, then, should not the Christian religion logically carry out all the plans of the socialists, anarchists, nihilists and all the other ists who want to change the face of the earth by legislation?

The Theosophist knows that legislation changes nothing whatever. There are laws now on every statute book in every state in the United States—laws enough, if men would only execute them and live up to them. . . . So what is the use of passing the law at all? There is no use whatever. Hence the Theosophical Society, as such, has nothing to do with such trumpery and democratic things such as legislation. Let the men engaged in legislation go on legislating. If a Theosophist is born to be a legislator, let him legislate as a citizen and not as a Theosophist, or if he is born to be a judge, let him be a judge and skilled lawyer. If they would know that philosophy which shows them what human life is, they will have begun to follow the law without knowing what the law is. . . . I believe personally that the day is coming when America is to be the country where the new race will be born that will know all about the true laws and what is right, and will be able to perform it. So, then, the Theosophical Society is not prepared to give out promulgations as to this or that particular item of legislation or education or civic affairs that people would have taught.

Mr. Judge here speaks of a time which lies in the future. All that we can say, now, is that the efforts of the present are part of the great preparation for that day. Dates are not given, save for the encouragements to be found in the closing pages of the *Key*. But what is plain and unequivocal is the *means* of that preparation, so far as students, co-workers, and companions in the Movement are concerned. Unity, study, and work are still the keys to progress in Theosophy, for both the individual and the world.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

From the Theosophical Forum

II

What is meant in the Proem of Secret Doctrine (Vol. I, page 14,) by the term "bare subjectivity" as contrasted with "Unconditioned Consciousness," for the latter would seem to be "bare subjectivity" itself? It is entirely comprehensible how the Absolute "Be-ness" may be symbolized, on the one hand, by abstract Space, and, on the other, by abstract Motion, but not so readily perceived how Space may be defined as "bare subjectivity" when Motion is contrasted with it as the pure noumenon of Thought.

W.Q.J.—In the *proem* cited the author distinctly says under (a) that "speculation is impossible" about the omnipresent Principle, and then to give one way of symbolizing it—which is certainly not definition—proceeds to state that that Infinite Principle is the same as the "unconscious" and "unknowable" of European philosophy, in which, indeed, the Forum editor takes delight. She then says it is symbolized in the *Secret Doctrine* as absolute abstract space, which one must conceive of as *space* distinct from all things existing therein; we cannot exclude this, nor at the same time really conceive of it. And in the same way, when we come to regard this omnipresent Principle from the point of view of the root of consciousness, we postulate it as being—in this aspect—*absolute abstract motion,* because consciousness has the quality of motion in it and not the quality of space, since motion has to have space in which to move. So then, having thus vaguely symbolized space, which is not consciousness, we have to say that, on the other hand, considering it as apart from consciousness, it may be said to be "bare subjectivity," although we have to use our consciousness in order to deal with it at all. The editor's question, "Can anyone conceive of abstract color?", seems peculiar, since it is not foreign to all the schools of Western thought, where many assert—as, indeed, it would appear they must—that apart from any particular motion or color we can conceive of motion and color in the abstract apart from particularization.

In "Secret Doctrine," Vol. I, p. 15, H.P.B. says: "This Infinite and Eternal Cause . . . is the rootless root of all that was, is, or ever shall be. It is of course devoid of all attributes, and is essentially without any relation to manifested, finite being." H.P.B. repeats the statement in other places in her works, and it has been a constant puzzle, for I cannot understand how It can be without relation to manifested being and at the same time be the root, however rootless, of all that was, is, or ever shall be. To my mind the essential idea of "root" is relation, and, as the word is used in the text, the ultimate of all relativity is reached.

W.Q.J.—I may use the laconic style of the Editor and reply: You are wrong. Not wrong in being puzzled, for that is evident, just as it is a fact that the quotation you make is *not* on page 15 of *Secret Doctrine,* Vol. I, but is found on p. 14. A little matter you think this error. Yes truly, but in high metaphysics little errors assume immense proportion, and the mistake as to the page will show liability to the other mistake of not looking into the whole subject. Only a few lines above the words quoted, H.P.B., defining a highly abstruse metaphysical position, lays down the proposition that there is "an omnipresent, eternal, boundless, and immutable PRINCIPLE on which all speculation is impossible." This is the "Rootless Root" spoken of. Its nature cannot be speculated on, although we may say IT IS, for we have to start from that. Necessarily it is out of relation to manifested things, since relativity begins only upon manifestation. You can perhaps say that this Rootless Root is potential of all things, but not that it is related. The "Rootless Root" is only a means of stating in convenient form what is said in the larger sentence I have quoted, and not to permit disputes as to relativity because of the meaning of "root." That such is H.P.B.'s meaning—in which she agrees with many old philosophers as well as some modern ones—is very clear indeed, for but four lines above the place where you culled your quotation she asks you to remember that this Principle "antedates all manifested conditioned being." But long and wordy speculations avail nothing, and unless you take the time to saturate your mind with metaphysics and the relative terminology which every philosophy is compelled to use—especially English—in speaking of things and ideas not relative, and become familiar with time and place for seeing a new meaning in words so materialistic as ours, you will always be puzzled. The word "spirit" is used in English in reference to God, to Man's Soul,

to Man's nervous currents, to elementals, to astral shells, to mere alcohol, and to describe simply a quality of an act, all these running up and down the gamut from most gross to highest spirit. Is it to be wondered at that you and the Editor found a difficulty in the question? In Sanscrit you would find no such difficulty.

What is the source of Conscience? From what plane does it come? Why does the savage delight in cruelty to his enemy, and the so-called enlightened man in sharp practices which the really enlightened know to be wrong? In other words, is Conscience a matter of education?

W.Q.J.—Conscience seems to be a faculty which may be stilled or made active. In my opinion its source is in the Higher Self, and as it comes down through plane after plane it loses its force or retains power according to the life and education of the being on earth. The conscience of the savage is limited by his education just as were the consciences of the New Englander and the European religionists who destroyed men for the sake of God and Christ. We cannot assert that the men who indulged in religious persecution were not going according to what they called their conscience. By this I do not mean that conscience is a matter of education, but that the power of its utterances will be limited by our education, and consequently if we have a bigoted religion or a non-philosophical system we are likely to prevent ourselves from hearing from our conscience. And in those cases where men are doing wrong according to what they call their conscience, it must be true that they have so warped their intuition as not to understand the voice of the inward monitor.

What in Theosophy is regarded as having been the original cause of the "obscuration of the effulgence of the mysterious Being of Tathagata"?

W.Q.J.—The Being of Tathagata is the Being of Buddha. It is a mystical statement made by orientals of the doctrine that the Divine Man, the Higher-Self of the Universe, has been obscured by its "descent into matter." For they hold that all Buddhas throughout eternity are the same, and that the Highest nature of Man is the same as the Buddha. Hence this sentence is only a statement that the original effulgence or glory radiated by the Highest Self becomes temporarily obscured by dwelling in matter during evolution; but that effulgence will be restored and shine again at the end of the

seventh Round because then matter will have been altered and refined by the indwelling effulgent Buddha. But such quotations as that in the question should never be given without the context in which they occur.

A VERY WONDERFUL FLOWER

"A French paper, *Les Mondes,* gives a fascinating account of a newly-discovered flower, of which rumours have from time to time reached the ears of floriculturists. It is called the snow flower, and is said to have been discovered by Count Anthoskoff in the most northern portion of Siberia, where the ground is continually covered with frost. This wonderful object shoots forth from the frozen soil only on the first day of each succeeding year. It shines for but a single day, and then resolves to its original elements. The leaves are three in number, and each about three inches in diameter. They are developed only on that side of the stem toward the north, and each seems covered with microscopic crystals of snow. The flower when it opens, is star-shaped, its petals of the same length as the leaves, and about half-an-inch in width. On the third day the extremities of the anthers, which are five in number, show minute glistening specks like diamonds, about the size of a pin's head, which are the seeds of this wonderful flower. Anthoskoff collected some of these seeds and carried them with him to St. Petersburg. They were placed in a pot of snow, where they remained for some time. On the 1st of the following January the miraculous snow flower burst through its icy covering, and displayed its beauties to the wondering Russian Royalty."—*Sheffield Independent.*

It is interesting to note that one of these wonderful snow flowers is mentioned in the *Voice of the Silence,* p. 39. The passage runs as follows:—

"Arhans are born at midnight hour, together with the sacred plant of nine and seven stalks, the holy flower that opes and blooms in darkness, out of the pure dew and on the frozen bed of snow-capped heights, heights that are trodden by no sinful foot."

Tradition adds that the flower blooms *fully* only when an Arhan is born.

—*Lucifer*

REINCARNATION AND MEMORY

THE question is often asked: If the theory of reincarnation be true, why have we no recollection of any previous life?

It may easily be conceived as possible that we have lived before on this earth, and that memory of the events of that existence has been blotted out. This lapse of memory is a frequent experience of every-day life; in fact, of all our varied experiences from youth to old age we really remember only a few of the most vivid, and can never recall all the details of even these. Indeed, we forget far more than we remember of the details of this present life, and the wonder is not so much how we can remember the few things that are partially retained, but how we can forget so much of experience that passes beyond all possible recovery. There is, no doubt, an absolute registration of every incident and experience in life, but nothing known to us as memory can possibly constitute that registry. The essence of what we designate as memory consists in our ability to recall into the sphere of consciousness past conditions and events, and this ability is seldom in any instance more than partial, and is always fleeting and uncertain. There are, indeed, flashes of memory where an event long forgotten is revived with unusual vividness, and we get the impression that nothing is really lost but that a latent or a passive memory contains them all, waiting only the touch of circumstance to recall them into being. So far as any legitimate function of memory is concerned, this is a fallacy. The absolute registration of events already referred to involves far more than can be assigned to the function of memory. This must be borne in mind, and we must accurately apprehend just what the word memory means, before we can intelligently discuss the real question under consideration. In other words, when we have carefully considered the fact, the function, and the phenomena of memory, we can easily understand why that which but partially records passing events, and never is able to recall them entirely, should be unable to bridge the chasm of perhaps a thousand years and recover the incidents of a previous incarnation. It may, moreover, appear presently that all that escapes memory, all that memory appears temporarily to retain but

---

NOTE.—This article by Jirah D. Buck was first published in five parts, over the signature "Harij," in Vol. IV of the *Path* (1889-1890), and was last reprinted in THEOSOPHY, Vol. 41.

in time loses, is nevertheless retained elsewhere and carried on from incarnation to incarnation. Let us bear constantly in mind that nothing exists without a cause, and that nothing is ever really lost. If this principle, recognized as everywhere true in physics, be true also in metaphysics and in all human experience, then each human being represents in himself and carries with him all previous experience, and is at any moment of his existence an epitome of all his past. It is, however, quite evident that nothing known to us as memory answers to this epitome, even for the present life.

The experiments in hypnotism have shown that consciousness and experience may exist independent of what we know as memory. An act to be performed at a future time and an exact date is fixed in some way on the sensorium, and the act is performed automatically at the exact time, although memory bears no record of the experience that led to the act. In another case memory may be impressed and confined to definite limits, thus showing that memory is relatively free from experience. Such illustrations might be multiplied indefinitely, to show that memory is not commensurate with all human experience, even in the present life.

As an element in man's being, consciousness is far broader and deeper than memory. Consciousness represents the fact of experience; memory the form and the details. Hence, while the fact remains and an experience one had can never be destroyed, the form and details in which it first appeared may pass away. This fact of experience remains as a precipitated result, and, divested of memory, i.e., of form and details, relations and sensations, constitutes the basic element in Karma. Add to the foregoing considerations the ethical element, or relation to other individuals, giving thus the element of motive, and we have the law of Karma deduced from the elements. In the first instance we have the individual as related to himself; in the second, as related to his fellows.

In a previous paper certain relations of experience to memory were considered, and Karma was shown to be a resultant of action. These are elementary considerations, yet none the less important. They are derived from the commonest everyday experience, and hence everyone can test them for himself. It might be profitable to observe, in passing, that this deduction of knowledge from experience is the only way of learning. We have within ourselves the elements and conditions of superior knowledge and illumination, but

so long as these elements are latent and inactive they are of no practical value. They make a grave, often a fatal, mistake who imagine that those possessed of supreme wisdom can bestow it upon the ignorant as a gratuity or a favor. They have not so received it, neither can they so impart it. The law never changes, and is the same for Adept and neophyte. Most truly says Hadji Erinn in the last PATH, *"It may be a child's school, but it takes a man to go through it."*

This digression seemed necessary in order to show the importance of the simpler primary propositions, and the manner in which they are to be received and tested. We are not dealing with Reincarnation as a dogma, but strictly as a scientific hypothesis. For any intelligent person nowadays to accept the special-creation theory, with birth into the present life as the beginning of man, is to confess the whole problem of life to be incomprehensible and all its mysteries incapable of solution. With shaded eyes and bated breath all such continually ask, *"What does it all mean?"* The most salient point, the most common objection to the theory of reincarnation, is the lapse of memory. If we could remember distinctly any existence previous to this, the problem would at once be solved. It would then be a matter of common experience, and no one would doubt it. Therefore, memory becomes the point of interest in examining the theory. If we are to estimate with any degree of certainty what memory may or may not do, what it may or may not have done, we must first determine by our own daily experience just what memory is now doing. Every reader, therefore, should pause after every statement, and inquire after every proposition—"Is this true? Is it in accordance with my own experience?" If he does this, and is careful as to the use and exact meaning of words, he will find the latent stores of knowledge beginning to unfold within his own soul, and the meaning of life will begin to appear. This knowledge of the true meaning of life will not depend on his acceptance of the theory of reincarnation as a dogma, though even in that way it is infinitely superior to any other, but the real benefit to the student will come from the fact that he is beginning to *know himself,* and to read correctly the lessons of his own experience. Those who oppose the reincarnation theory almost invariably show utter ignorance of these primary considerations, the very alphabet of the whole subject. The questions involved are so deep, so broad, and in their final application so abstruse, that an error in the beginning leads to endless com-

plications and misconceptions further on. This is because human experience covers such a wide area, and human relations are so complicated; and any theory capable of meeting these experiences at every point must be equally potent and applicable. If, therefore, reincarnation be true, and be thus involved in human experience and capable of explaining the mysteries of life, it must be capable of logical deduction from these same experiences. Its ground of operation is our legitimate ground for investigation. Those who are unable or unwilling to study the subject in this way may accept the theory as a dogma, or deny it altogether, as they please; though at this point a great deal may be said as to motive and result on human action. From the standpoint of dogma the principle of *Justice,* both human and divine, overwhelmingly supports reincarnation; while every other theory known to modern times is horribly *unjust;* thus favoring priest-craft and king-craft, and rendering the essential Brotherhood of man impossible.

> Man's inhumanity to man
> Makes countless millions mourn.

The essence of humanity is justice; the essence of all inhumanity is injustice. Wherever exact justice reigns, divine Charity glorifies life with the halo of Divinity.

These preliminary considerations may help to set our subject in its true light, and serve in divesting it of all prejudice. Only in this way can we examine any subject dispassionately, with any probability of arriving at the simple truth.

We may now return to our original inquiry: If the theory of reincarnation be true, why have we no recollection of any previous life? Passing by all those cases where such reminiscence is claimed by certain individuals like Apollonius of Tyana, and certain experiences difficult of explanation on any other ground in the life of many persons, passing by such considerations as favor belief in reincarnation on the ground of Justice, let us consider memory in relation to experience. From the known character of memory deduced from daily experience, is there any reason to expect it to bridge the chasm between two incarnations, provided more than the present incarnation has existed for the individual? If not, why not? Put in another form, our thesis may be stated in this way: Is the absence of memory of a previous life any bar to the acceptance and rational application of the theory of reincarnation?

The terms cause and effect are related to phenomena. The

essence of phenomena is motion, or action. Every so-called cause is involved in its effect, and every so-called effect becomes in its turn a cause of further action to be involved in all succeeding effects. Man has sometimes been called "a creature of circumstance." This is a half-truth. Man is also a creator of circumstance. In other words, man bears the same general relation to cause and effect as does every object in nature. If we observe any object in nature we discover it giving rise to the theatre of phenomena. If we find it acting, we may trace the so-called causes of its present activities. If we find it apparently quiescent, we may discover what activities it will presently give rise to. There is thus a period of activity followed by a period of repose, and this followed by renewed activity. All nature is thus instinct with life, for life is essential action. Thus "the out-breathing and in-breathing of Brahm" involves every atom and every object, no less than every organism.

Life's pulses quiver everywhere,
  A solemn rhythm reigns;
A measured tread is in the air,
  The ocean throbs with pain.
The solid earth its pulses keeps
  While shadows come and go;
Deeps answer always unto deeps,
  Glow answers unto glow.
Back of all action there is rest;
  Behind all rest the flame
Of life but smoulders in Brahm's breast,
  Ready to glow again.

In the further discussion of this subject we need a few terms with definite meanings, such as every one can understand. We are looking at the doctrine of reincarnation from a single standpoint, and for this one view a comprehensive philosophy and exhaustive classification are not necessary. We need only to appeal to common experience and to logical deductions drawn therefrom. The self-conscious center in man we call the *ego*. Experience is the varied relations existing between the ego and all its surroundings or environment resulting in action. Action implies re-action. If the ego in man acts upon his environment, so environment re-acts upon the ego. This action and re-action constitute man's experience. The law of this action, that is, the direct relation between action and re-action, is that of all force, all attraction, all motion everywhere, viz., quantity and quality are both mathematical and rhythmical. Circu-

lar motion begets circular motion, like attracts like. For every given impulse sent out a like impulse is returned, both as to form and as to intensity or quantity. The self-conscious center in man, the *ego,* the "I," stands in the center of his "sphere of life," is the center of his environment, and it therefore actually stands between two worlds; the seen and the unseen; the world of action and the world of thought; the world of effects and the world of causes. Now the unseen world of causes, whence come our thoughts, our impulses, the "within" to all of man's outer world, or the center of his sphere, is also the *noumenal* or spiritual world, as contrasted with his phenomenal or physical world. Man's experience, therefore, whether he is aware of it or not, is drawn constantly from these two worlds, though seldom in equal degree. We say of one, "He is a man of action"; of another, "He is a man of thought." We say of one. "He is spiritually minded"; of another, "He is carnally minded." We say of one, "He lives on a low plane"; of another, "He is high-minded." It may thus be seen that both our observation and common experience have become stereotyped in forms of common expression. The logical deduction thus drawn from common experience and observation leads to the conception that man is a conscious centre between an upper and a lower world; or, if you please, that the "sphere" of man's life, of which the ego is the conscious center, is composed of two semi-spheres. A perfect sphere is an ideal in nature. It is the design drawn by the *Architect* upon the phenomenal trestle-board of nature. In outer nature the sphere is always imperfect. Every fruit, like an apple, for example, has an actual center. Just as an ideal sphere which it represents has an ideal center. These ideals only are perfect. The core, or seed-pit of the apple, is its center of life, but the two halves made by cleavage through the core, are neither equal nor symmetrical, hence they are imperfect. The design of nature is its ideal. Without this ideal there could be no persistence of form, no such thing as species, no correspondences, no harmony.

(To be concluded)

letters • questions • comment

What is the best way to learn how our minds work and how to use them in accordance with the laws of nature?

This is a question worth considering since it implies that, even with the great attention now given to some functions of the mind, there is a kind of understanding that has scarcely been hinted at, and certainly not adequately explored. While Eastern philosophies in ages past taught disciplines for using the mind, these methods require study in a majestic context of metaphysical structure and moral verity, making them not easily assimilable in the West, perhaps such disciplines are the appropriate fruition of a society long in the making, the end result of many generations of experiment and refinement, a heritage which we lack the ethical maturity to claim. So that even though we might do well to recognize the truths these systems contain, we cannot adopt them bodily, but must recast their truths in terms of our own development, admitting the priorities and prerequisites which are involved.

Why should there have been neglect of certain facets of the mind, to the point where our culture has no means of identifying or studying them? It is not only because the higher mind has been ignored in Western culture that this lack exists, but because men have so grossly misconceived their natures and potentialities. For centuries it was commonly accepted that man was incapable of understanding either the "inscrutable ways" of God, or the obscurities of his own behavior. How indeed, could anything like this be attempted by men who conceived of themselves as wholly the creation of an all-powerful being outside themselves?

It seems that only great poets such as Shakespeare and intuitive authors such as Dostoevsky could reach conscious awareness of the contradictions in human life, although a determined individual here and there might break out of the common cultural bondage. It might be said further that since the advent of Freud we have been mainly preoccupied with psychological abnormality, illness, and limitation. Yet Freud's researches eventually stimulated studies of so-called normal behavior, and the spread of internal tensions, psy-

chosomatic ills and indefinable discontents led thoughtful individuals to look beyond the disorders of behavior to the values by which we define what behavior ought to be. Now we are painfully discovering that we lack a clear idea of what man actually is.

All men want to think of themselves as real. So the study of the mind should properly begin with the recognition of the human being as an enduring spiritual entity, with a potential for growth that is unlimited. If this idea were seriously applied it would lead to the recognition of the presence in man of a sense of egoic continuity, which, for one thing, would make "immortality" depend, not on arguments for a future life, but on the ever-present feeling of the substance of eternity within. If this immovable and indestructible sense of identity, even if faint, were an established reality in consciousness, it could become the vantage point for a study of the infinite variety of mental phenomena that we experience.

In discovering the reality of an enduring presence within ourselves, we are prompted to seek the same in others, and to respond to that presence in the natural life all around us. We are in a position to notice that the rhythms of nature have their correspondences in the subtle motions of our own minds and in those we contact in daily life. We discover for instance, that the mind, too, has its seasons. What may be rejected today out-of-hand as unimportant, or even totally incomprehensible, might, if allowed to germinate, grow not only into acceptance, but also into an appreciation that the "community of minds" does not mean surrender of individual integrity.

Observance of the prominence of mutual assistance in animal communities suggests that this also has a parallel significance in the field of manasic life. Acceptance of a human nature possessed in common by all men, though by no means in identical mode, could lead to a study of ourselves and others as an opportunity for growth. If we could see in the shortcomings we perceive in others only our own weaknesses in a different guise, we could learn to understand them, not as "his" failings or "ours," but simply as failures to see clearly. Such study of the mind would help to provide the basis for a real nucleus of universal brotherhood.

THINGS COMMON TO CHRISTIANITY AND THEOSOPHY

THAT the Theosophical Society is not opposed to Christianity in either its dogmatic or pure form is easily demonstrated. Our constitution forbids it and the second object of the Society does also. The laws of our body say that there shall be no crusade against any religion, tacitly excepting, of course, the few degraded and bestial religions now in the world; the second object provides for a full and free study of all religions without bias and without hatred or sectarianism. And our history also, offering to view branch societies all over the world composed of Christians, refutes the charge that the Society as such is opposed to Christianity. One instance is enough, that of the well-known Scottish Lodge, which states in its printed Transactions No. IX, "Theosophists who are Christians (and such are the majority of the Scottish Lodge). . . . Therefore Christians who are sincere and who know what Theosophy means must be Theosophists. . . ." If members of the Society have said to the contrary it has been from ignorance and a careless thinking for on the same ground we should also be opposed to all other religions which have any forms, and both Brahmanism and Buddhism have as much of formalism as has Christianity. Generally speaking, then, the Society is not and cannot be opposed to Christianity, while it may lead to a denial of some of the men-made theories of that Church.

But that is no more than branches of Christianity have always been doing, nor is it as much a danger to formal Christianity as the new standards of criticism which have crept into the Church.

Nor can it be either that Theosophy as a whole is opposed to Christianity, inasmuch as Theosophy is and must be the one truth underlying all religions that have ever been among men. A calm and sincere examination of all the world's religions reveals the fact that in respect to ethics, in respect to laws, in respect to precepts or example or effect on daily life, or even in respect to cosmogony and cosmology, the other religious books of the world are the same

---

NOTE.—This article, an address before the Aryan Theosophical Society by William Q. Judge, N.Y., Jan. 9, 1894, is reprinted from a pamphlet of similar title published in that year.

in most respects as those of the Christians, and that the distinguishing difference between the latter's religion and the others is that it asserts an exclusiveness for itself and a species of doctrinal intolerance not found in the rest.

If we take the words and the example of Jesus as the founder of Christianity, it is at once seen that there is no opposition at all between that form of religion and Theosophy. Indeed, there is the completest agreement. New ethics are not brought forward by Theosophy, nor can they be, as ethics of the right sort must always be the same. In his sermons and sayings are to be found the ethics given out by Buddha and by all other great teachers of all time. These cannot be altered, even though they hold up to weak mortals an ideal that is very difficult to live up to and sometimes impossible to realize in daily life. That these rules of conduct laid down by Jesus are admittedly hard to follow is shown in the behavior of Christian states toward each other and in the declarations of their high prelates that the religion of Jesus cannot be the basis for diplomatic relations nor for the state government. Hence we find that the refuge from all this adopted by the theologian is in the statement that, although other and older religions had moral truth and similar ethics to those of Jesus, the Christian religion is the only one wherein the founder asserted that he was not merely a teacher from God, but was also at the same time God himself; that is, that prior to Jesus a great deal of good was taught, but God did not see fit until the time of Jesus to come down among men into incarnation. Necessarily such a declaration would seem to have the effect of breeding intolerance from the high and exclusive nature of the claim made. But an examination of Brahmanism shows that Rama was also God incarnate among men, though there the doctrine did not arouse the same sum of intolerance among its believers. So it must be true that it is not always a necessary consequence of such a belief that aggressive and exclusive intolerance will grow up.

The beliefs and teachings of Christianity are not all supportable by the words of Jesus, but his doctrines are at all times in accord with Theosophy. There is certainly a wide difference between the command of Jesus to be poor and to have neither staff nor money and the fact of the possession by the Church of vast sums of money and immense masses of property, and with the drawing of high salaries by prelates, and with the sitting of prelates among the rulers of the earth upon thrones, and in the going to war and the levying

of taxes by the Pope and by other religious heads. The gathering of tithes and enforcement of them by law and by imprisonment at the instance of the Protestant clergy are not at all consistent with the words of Jesus. But all of the foregoing inconsistent matters are a part of present Christianity, and if in those respects a difference from or opposition to them should seem to arise from Theosophical teachings we must admit it, but cannot be blamed. If we go back to the times of the early Christians and compare that Christianity with the present form, we see that opposition by Theosophy could hardly be charged, but that the real opposition then would be between that early form of the religion and its present complexion. It has been altered so much that the two are scarcely recognizable as the same. This is so much so that there exists a Christian sect to-day called "Early Christian."

Every one has at all times a right to object to theological interpretations if they are wrong, or if they distort the original teaching or introduce new notions. In this respect there is a criticism by Theosophy and Theosophists. But thinkers in the world not members of this Society and not leaning to Theosophy do the same thing. Huxley and Tyndall and Darwin and hosts of others took ground that by mere force of truth and fact went against theological views. Galileo also, seeing that the earth was round and moved, said so, but the theologian, thinking that such belief tended to destroy the power of the church and to upset biblical theories, made him recant at the risk of his liberty and life. If the old views of theology were still in force with the state behind them, the triumphs of science would have been few and we might still be imagining the earth flat and square and the sun revolving about it.

Theosophical investigation discloses to the student's view the fact that in all ages there have appeared great teachers of religion and that they all had two methods of instruction. One, or that for the masses of people, was plain and easy to understand; it was of ethics, of this life and of the next, of immortality and love; it always gave out the Golden Rule. Such a teacher was Buddha, and there can be no controversy on the fact that he died centuries before the birth of Jesus. He declared his religion to be that of love. Others did the same. Jesus came and taught ethics and love, with the prominent exception of his prophecy that he came to bring a sword and division as recorded in the Gospels. There is also an incident which accents a great difference between him and Buddha; it is the feast where

he drank wine and also made some for others to drink. In regard to this matter, Buddha always taught that all intoxicating liquors were to be rigidly abstained from. The second method was the secret or Esoteric one, and that Jesus also used. We find his disciples asking him why he always used easy parables with the people, and he replied that to the disciples he taught the mysteries, or the more recondite matters of religion. This is the same as prevailed with the older saints. Buddha also had his private teachings to certain disciples. He even made a distinction among his personal followers, making classes in their ranks, to one of which he gave the simple rules, to the other the complex and difficult. So he must have pursued the ancient practise of having two sets of teachings, and this must have been a consequence of his education.

At twelve years of age he came to the temple and disputed with the learned rabbis on matters of the law. Thus he must have known the law; and what that law was and is, it is necessary to ask. It was the law of Moses, full of the most technical and abstruse things, and not all to be found in the simple words of the books. The Hebrew books are a vast mine of cypher designedly so constructed, and that should be borne in mind by all students. It ought to be known to Christians, but is not, as they prefer not to go into the mysteries of the Jews. But Jesus knew it. His remark that "not one jot or tittle of the law would pass" shows this. Most people read this simply as rhetoric, but it is not so. The jots and tittles are a part of the books and go to make up the cypher of the Cabala or the hidden meaning of the law. This is a vast system of itself, and was not invented after the time of Jesus. Each letter is also a number, and thus every word can be and is, according to a well-known rule, turned into some other word or into a number. Thus one name will be a part of a supposed historical story, but when read by the cypher it becomes a number of some cycle or event or a sign of the Zodiac or something else quite different from the mere letters. Thus the name of Adam is composed of three consonants, A, D, and M. These mean by the system of the cypher respectively "Adam, David, and Messiah." The Jews also held that Adam for his first sin would have to and did reincarnate as David and would later come as Messiah. Turning to Revelations we find traces of the same system in the remarks about the numbers of the beast and the man. The Cabala or hidden law is of the highest importance, and as the Christian religion is a Hebraic one it cannot be properly studied or understood without the

aid given by the secret teaching. And the Cabala is not dead or unknown, but has many treatises written on it in different languages. By using it, we will find in the Old Testament and in the records of Jesus a complete and singular agreement with Theosophy.

Examine, for instance, the Theosophical teachings that there is a secret or esoteric doctrine, and the doctrine of inability of man to comprehend God. This is the Brahmanical doctrine of the unapproachableness of Parabrahm. In Exodus there is a story which to the profane is absurd, of God telling Moses that he could not see him. It is in Exodus, xxxiii, 20, where God says Moses could see him from behind only. Treat this by the rule of the Cabala and it is plain, but read it on the surface and you have nonsense. In Exodus iii, 14, God says that his name is "I am that I am." This is AHYH ASHR AHYH, which has to be turned into its numerical value, as each letter is also a number. Thus A is 1, H is 5, Y is 10, H is 5. There being two words the same, they add up 42. The second word is A, 1; SH, 300; R, 200; making 501, which added to 42 gives 543 as the number of "I am that I am." Now Moses by the same system makes 345 or the reverse of the other, by which the Cabala shows God meant Moses to know God by his reverse or Moses himself. To some this may appear fanciful, but as it is the method on which these old books are constructed it must be known in order to understand what is not clear and to remove from the Christian books the well-sustained charge of absurdity and sometimes injustice and cruelty shown on their face. So instead of God's being made ridiculous by attributing to him such a remark as that Moses could only "see his hinder parts," we perceive that under the words is a deep philosophical tenet corresponding to that of Theosophy, that Parabrahm is not to be known and that Man is a small copy of God through which in some sense or in the reverse we may see God.

For the purposes of this discussion along the line of comparison we will have to place Christianity on one side and put on the other as representing the whole body of Theosophy, so far as revealed, the other various religions of the world, and see what, if anything, is common between them. First we see that Christianity, being the younger, has borrowed its doctrines from other religions. It is now too enlightened an age to say, as the Church did when Abbé Huc brought back his account of Buddhism from Tibet, that either the devil or wicked men invented the old religions so as to confuse and confute the Christian. Evidently, no matter how done, the system

of the Christian is mixed Aryan and Jewish. This could not be otherwise, since Jesus was a Jew, and his best disciples and the others who came after like Paul were of the same race and faith. The early Fathers also, living as they did in Eastern lands, got their ideas from what they found about them.

Next a very slight examination will disclose the fact that the ritual of the Christian Church is also borrowed. Taken from all nations and religions, not one part of it is either of this age or of the Western Hemisphere. The Brahmans have an extensive and elaborate ritual, and so have the Buddhists. The rosary, long supposed by Catholics to be a thing of their own, has existed in Japan for uncounted years, and much before the West had any civilization the Brahman had his form of rosary. The Roman Catholic Christian sees the priest ring the bell at a certain part of the Mass, and the old Brahman knows that when he is praying to God he must also ring a bell to be found in every house as well as in the temple. This is very like what Jesus commanded. He said that prayer must be in secret, that is, where no one can hear; the Brahman rings the small bell so that even if ears be near they shall not hear any words but only the sound of the bell. The Christian has images of virgin and child; the same thing is to be found in Egyptian papyri and in carved statues in India made before the Christian came into existence. Indeed, all the ritual and observance of the Christian churches may be found in the mass of other religions with which for the moment we are making a rough comparison.

Turning now to doctrine, we find again complete agreement with the dogmatic part of Christianity in these older religions. Salvation by faith is taught by some priests. That is an old Brahmanical theory, but with the difference that the Brahman one calls for faith in God as the means, the end, and the object of faith. The Christian adds faith in the son of God. A form of Japanese Buddhism said to be due to Amitabha says that one may be saved by complete faith in Amita Buddha, and that even if one prays but three times to Amita he will be saved in accordance with a vow made by that teacher. Immortality of soul has even been taught by the Brahmans. Their whole system of religion and of cosmogony is founded on the idea of soul and of spiritual nature of the universe. Jesus and St. Paul taught the unity of spiritual beings—or men—when they said that heaven and the spirit of God were in us, and the doctrine of Unity is one of the oldest and most important of the Brahmanical scheme.

The possibility of arriving at perfection by means of religion and science combined so that a man becomes godlike—or the doctrine of Adepts and Mahatmas as found in Theosophy—is common to Buddhism and Brahmanism, and is not contrary to the teachings of Jesus. He said to his disciples that they could if they would do even greater works—or "miracles"—than he did. To do these works one has to have great knowledge and power. The doctrine assumes the perfectability of humanity and destroys the theory of original sin; but far from being out of concordance with the religion of Jesus, it is in perfect accord. He directed his followers to be perfect even as the Father in heaven is. They could not come up to that command by any possibility unless man has the power to reach to that high state. The command is the same as is found in the ancient Aryan system. Hence, then, whether we look broadly over the field at mere ritual dogma or at ethics, we find the most complete accord between Theosophy and true Christianity.

But now taking up some important doctrines put forward by members of the Theosophical Society under their right of free investigation and free speech, what do we discover? Novelty, it is true, to the mind of the Western man half-taught about his own religion, but nothing that is uncommon to Christianity. Those doctrines may be, for the present, such as Reincarnation or rebirth over and over again for the purpose of discipline and gain, for reward, for punishment, and for enlargement of character; next Karma, or exact justice or compensation for all thoughts and acts. These two are a part of Christianity, and may be found in the Bible.

Reincarnation has been regarded by some Christian ministers as essential to the Christian religion. Dr. Edward Beecher said he saw its necessity, and the Rev. Wm. Alger has recorded his view to the same effect. If a Christian insists upon belief in Jesus, who came only eighteen centuries ago after millenniums had passed and men had died out of the faith by millions, it will be unjust for them to be condemned for a failure to believe a doctrine they never heard of; hence the Christian may well say that under the law of reincarnation, which was upheld by Jesus, all those who never heard of Jesus will be reborn after his coming in A.D. 1, so as to accept the plan of salvation.

In the Gospels we find Jesus referring to this doctrine as if a well established one. When it was broached by the disciples as the possible reason for the punishment by blindness from birth of a man of the time, Jesus did not controvert the doctrine, as he would have

done did he see in his wisdom as Son of God that it was pernicious. But at another time he asserted that John the Baptist was the reincarnation of Elias the ancient prophet. This cannot be wiped out of the books, and is a doctrine as firmly fixed in Christianity, though just now out of favor, as is any other. The paper by Prof. Landsberg shows you what Origen, one of the greatest of the Christian Fathers, taught on preëxistence of souls. This theory naturally suggests reincarnation on this earth, for it is more natural to suppose the soul's wanderings to be here until all that life can give has been gained, rather than that the soul should wander among other planets or simply fall to this abruptly, to be as suddenly raised up to heaven or thrown down to hell.

The next great doctrine is Karma. This is the religion of salvation by works as opposed to faith devoid of works. It is one of the prime doctrines of Jesus. By "by their works ye shall know them," he must have meant that faith without works is dead. The meaning of *Karma* literally is "works," and the Hindus apply it not only to the operations of nature and of the great laws of nature in connection with man's reward and punishment, but also to all the different works that man can perform. St. James insists on the religion of works. He says that true religion is to visit the fatherless and the widows and to keep oneself unspotted from the world. St. Matthew says we shall be judged for every act, word, and thought. This alone is possible under the doctrine of Karma. The command of Jesus to refrain from judgment or we should ourselves be judged is a plain statement of Karma, as is, too, the rest of the verse saying that what we mete out shall be given back to us. St. Paul, following this, distinctly states the doctrine thus: "Brethren, be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that also shall he reap." The word "whatsoever" includes every act and thought, and permits no escape from the consequences of any act. A clearer statement of the law of Karma as applied to daily life could hardly be made. Again, going to Revelations, the last words in the Christian book, we read all through it that the last judgment proceeds on the work—in other words, on the Karma—of men. It distinctly asserts that in the vision, as well as in the messages to the Churches, judgment passes for works.

We therefore must conclude that the religion of Jesus is in complete accord with the chief doctrines of Theosophy; it is fair to assume that even the most recondite of theosophical theories would

not have been opposed by him. Our discussion must have led us to the conclusion that the religion of Karma, the practise of good works, is that in which the religion of Jesus agrees with Theosophy, and that alone thereby will arrive the longed-for day when the great ideal of Universal Brotherhood will be realized, and will furnish the common ground on which all faiths may stand and from which every nation may work for the good and the perfection of the human family.

Impersonality

The question of personality is so large that it might seem as though its successful solution should resemble the working out of a complicated mathematical problem. But the greatest truths are the simplest. And if we reflect a moment on what impersonality *is not,* perhaps that will help us to see what it *is.*

Some orate forcibly against personality. That does not prove they are free from it.

Some say little, but the effect of what is said is to imply that *they* are impersonal. They seem so modest, but are only politic.

Some are afraid to talk about personality, thinking that it must be shunned as an ogre.

Yet others preach a doctrine of impersonality which takes everything human out of life and makes of it a cold negation. This doctrine has no patience with *evolution*—all faults must disappear at a single stroke.

Impersonality isn't talking; it isn't silence; it isn't insinuation; it isn't repulsion; it isn't negation. Above all, it isn't a diplomacy which masks *ambition.*

Impersonality means freedom from personality, but none of us are going to attain that, right away; we are doing well enough if we are persistently, albeit slowly, overcoming.

For practical purposes: if we are developing the child-heart; if we are learning to love things beautiful; if we are becoming more honest and plain and simple; if we are beginning to sense the sweet side of life; if we are getting to like our friends better and extending the circle; if we feel ourselves expanding in sympathy; if we love to work for Theosophy and do not ask position as a reward; if we are not bothering too much about whether we are personal or impersonal—this is traveling on the path of impersonality.

—Robert Crosbie

on the lookout

Inner Controls

An article by Robert Ardrey in the *New York Times* (Sept. 27, 1971) observes that, although animal populations are regulated because of environmental conditions, the regulation itself comes from within the animals, not from outside intervention. That is, it is not by starvation that animal populations are reduced to a size commensurate with the food supply, nor do predators completely account for control of population. In Mr. Ardrey's words:

> Contrary to all of our assumptions since the days of Thomas Malthus, animal populations do not build up their numbers to that point where they encounter the veto of exhausted food supply. A remarkable repertory of built-in mechanisms, behavioral or physiological, compel the normal species to keep the numbers of its young well within the carrying capacity of its habitat.

Elephant Populations

One of the major factors in determining size of herds, according to Ardrey, is available breeding territory. He cites the elephants of Uganda by way of example:

> One does not think of the elephant as a probable pamphleteer for contraception. And indeed, how elephants do it, no scientist can say. But in recent years, in the Murchison Falls area of Western Uganda, something like a laboratory-in-the-wild has come about. The spread of cultivated land, particularly since independence, has forced more and more elephant herds into the protected park. Divided by the broad, crocodile-haunted Victoria Nile, two distinct populations have built up on its north and south sides, each numbering seven or eight thousand. Ninety percent of an elephant's forage is grass, and food remains abundant. Nevertheless, the south bank's more restricted space has produced far more severe conditions of overcrowding than the north's. And here the elephant is reducing his numbers. Normal spacing of calves is four years. On the south bank it has risen to nine. The onset of female fertility occurs usually at eleven or twelve. Here it has risen to eighteen.

But territorial needs are not the whole story either, for he says further:

> Yet territorial behavior is but one means of limitation. In an English woodland, if the numbers of great tits double, the next season egg clutch-size will be reduced by two. In an Iowa marshland if muskrat numbers rise too high, then the mother muskrat produces fewer embryos, or re-absorbs them.

Struggle and Cooperation

The natural conclusion seems to be that population control, part of the larger issue of the struggle for existence, should not be identified with the idea of competition within the species. (Further illustrations of population control by animals are given by Farley Mowat in *Never Cry Wolf.*) Peter Kropotkin, in his book *Mutual Aid,* published in 1902, pointed out that while the "struggle for existence" is actual enough, its importance as a factor in evolution has been greatly exaggerated:

> As soon as we study animals—not in laboratories and museums only, but in the forest and the prairie, in the steppe and the mountains—we at once perceive that though there is an immense amount of warfare and extermination going on amidst various species, and especially amidst various classes of animals, there is, at the same time, as much, or perhaps even more, of mutual support, mutual aid, and mutual defence amidst animals belonging to the same species or, at least, to the same society. Sociability is as much a law of nature as mutual struggle. Of course it would be extremely difficult to estimate, however roughly, the relative numerical importance of both these series of facts. But if we resort to an indirect test, and ask Nature: "Who are the fittest: those who are continually at war with each other, or those who support one another?" we at once see that those animals which acquire habits of mutual aid are undoubtedly the fittest. They have more chances to survive, and they attain, in their respective classes, the highest development of intelligence and bodily organization. If the numberless facts which can be brought forward to support this view are taken into account, we may safely say that mutual aid is as much a law of animal life as mutual struggle, but that, as a factor of evolution it most probably has a far greater importance, inasmuch as it favours the development of the species, together with the greatest amount of welfare and enjoyment of life for the individual, with the least waste of energy.

Darwin's View

Mr. Ardrey, it should be added, believes that violence was an early component of man's nature, originally derived from animal

forebears and fostered by the need to hunt. But it became significant in the establishment and maintenance of territorial needs. From this he concludes that violence is a natural and therefore acceptable factor in human relationships.

However, both Ardrey's observations on the tendency of animals to regulate their numbers by some other impulse than environmental compulsion, and Kropotkin's voluminous illustrations in support of cooperation in contrast to competition, suggest that the most fruitful way to study the processes of nature is by viewing the collectivity of nature itself as embodied consciousness. The "struggle for life," as Kropotkin points out, is not an inevitable competition among members of the same species for an individual advantage, but simply one way in which that consciousness progressively refines its forms. And Darwin, it should be remembered, held that human fitness was in terms of intellectual and moral qualities.

Upward March

H.P.B. places this struggle in its proper relationship to the evolutionary process:

> The whole order of nature evinces a progressive march towards *a higher life*. There is design in the action of the seemingly blindest forces. The whole process of evolution with its endless adaptations is a proof of this. The immutable laws that weed out the weak and feeble species, to make room for the strong, and which ensure the "survival of the fittest," though so cruel in their immediate action—all are working toward the grand end. The very *fact* that adaptations *do* occur, that the fittest *do* survive in the struggle for existence, shows that what is called "unconscious Nature" is in reality an aggregate of forces manipulated by semi-intelligent beings (Elementals) guided by High Planetary Spirits (Dhyan Chohans), whose collective aggregate forms the manifested *verbum* of the unmanifested LOGOS, and constitutes at one and the same time the MIND of the Universe and its immutable LAW. (*S.D.* I, 277-78.)

Transcending Violence

Insofar as man participates in the laws of the lower kingdoms, it is becoming daily more apparent that much remains to be understood about the laws of cooperation suggested by Kropotkin's "mutual aid." But beyond the behavior that promotes the survival and well-being of the species, Man, what does mutual aid mean in distinctly human terms? How may human beings deliberately contribute to moral or spiritual evolution? Investigation of the ideas of non-violence and mutual aid at the psychological level would

ndoubtedly disclose a whole field of endeavor that has been unexplored except in isolated instances. Erik Erikson, in *Gandhi's Truth,* examines Gandhi's methods of transforming human conflict into constructive non-violent action. Gandhi maintained that the key to this was in perception of truthful action, or those acts from which all parties would gain.

Gandhi's View

Erikson explains this process as one of preserving the respect for the truth in each party:

> Truthful action, for Gandhi, was governed by the readiness to get hurt and yet not to hurt—action governed by the principle of *ahimsa.* According to Bondurant "the only dogma in the Gandhian philosophy centers here: that the only test of truth is action based on the refusal to do harm." With all respect for the traditional translation of *ahimsa,* I think Gandhi implied in it, besides a refusal not to do physical harm, a determination not to violate another person's essence. For even where one may not be able to avoid harming or hurting, forcing or demeaning another whenever one must coerce him, one should try even in doing so, not to violate his essence, for such violence can only evoke counter-violence, which may end in a kind of truce, but not in truth. For *ahimsa* as acted upon by Gandhi not only means not to hurt another, it means to respect the truth in him. Gandhi reminds us that, since we can not possibly know the absolute truth, we are "therefore not competent to punish"—a most essential reminder, since man when tempted to violence always parades as another's policeman, convincing himself that whatever he is doing to another, that other "has it coming to him." Whoever acts on such righteousness, however, implicates himself in a mixture of pride and guilt which undermines his position psychologically and ethically. Against this typical cycle, Gandhi claimed that only the voluntary acceptance of self-suffering can reveal the truth latent in a conflict—and in the opponent.

Clean-up Not Enough

In a survey of the prospects for the recovery of ecological balance, Gordon Harrison ("Making Peace With the Earth," *Saturday Review,* Nov. 6, 1971) maintains that merely to clean up pollution will not be enough; needed is a broadening of values to encompass something more than a knowledge of how to manipulate nature for the advantage of man, or more exactly, for a minority of men:

> If the ecological revolt exhausts itself in a giant pick-up/clean-up, if indeed the new awakening to man's dependence on his environment is diverted into a passion for cleanliness, and

> we pursue that *Doppelgänger* without precisely counting the costs, we will have failed the challenge, and may end up with a cleaner but otherwise worse world. If, for instance, the charge for cleanliness is added to everybody's cost of living, the poor will pay disproportionately. If taking care of the environment is embraced in lieu of more difficult causes, and resources are diverted to sewage treatment plants or parks that might otherwise have gone to housing, health, welfare, and schools, most of us would think this a perversion, not a reordering, of values. Finally, if the economy purges itself of the burden of pollution only in order to be free to run even faster after endlessly elaborated consumer goods, then we will have profited no more from our sober interlude than the junkie who kicks the habit in order to go on to cheaper highs.

Respect for Life

Mr. Harrison illustrates the kind of change required by citing the discontinuance of the use of powerful pesticides against cotton pests in the Cañete Valley in Peru. The growers adopted different cultivation methods designed to restore the total ecological system of the area, thus bringing the pests under control also. This works in the long run and DDT doesn't, he says, for the reason that no one species can be identified as "the enemy" whose extermination may be justified at any cost. As Mr. Harrison puts it: "It is the special arrogance of man, and may be the death of him, to think that any living thing can be dismissed as merely a nuisance."

This leads him to reflect on the importance of preserving diversity within the community:

> Man thrives on differences; culturally and biologically, they have enabled us to progress. Yet, man everywhere acts to ensure uniformity. He is driven by a passion to reiterate a few successes and let go whatever cannot make it big. That is a characteristic of mass civilization, of a technology that can stamp out copies cheaply by the billion, and of an economic system that rewards numbers more obviously than quality. But it is also a biologically normal consequence of creature drives. Humanity bent on the take-over of the earth for its own exclusive habitat wipes out the variety of competing life forms. Within the human race the dominant majorities tend to overwhelm the dissident and nonconformist minorities for no other reason than that they can.

Tolerance of Differences

> In nature the losers in the fight for peck order, the less well-adapted, normally are driven out and their chance for survival lies chiefly in their ability to adapt to another environmental niche. Through migration and genetic change natural systems

thus both accommodate variety and enrich it. As man is in total occupation of the human niche, and this is coterminous with the planet, there is no place left for difference to go. If difference is to survive, it must somehow coexist with dominance. That is to say, those who have the power must be persuaded or forced by irrepressible rebellion (see the history of totalitarian societies) to moderate its use in order, for their own ultimate benefit, to tolerate those whom they could destroy. That forbearance is required equally of all men in regard to other living things and of human majorities in regard to the oddballs among us.

ndividuals Must Learn

Thus, what the lower kingdoms do by instinct, men must learn o do through conscious choice. But the ability to choose diversity as a constructive framework on the human level implies a vision of wholeness and cooperation based upon individual understanding:

> Only to individuals can come the saving insights into the range of human needs and the complexities of the world community that is to be managed to meet those needs. Because that is so, we face a paradox that could justify despair or bright new hope: At the same time that people have come to depend on systems so complicated and remote that no one can claim to control them, society as never before needs the guidance of the individual. The ecological revolt recognizes that need and to some degree is meeting it. There lies the hope. But realization will take persistence and courage never before demanded of a citizens' movement.

Mr. Harrison's contention that the values we hold will determine what kind of strengths we can bring to the re-creation of society seems legitimate. But if the primary objective is spiritual evolution, rather than just a more satisfactory arrangement of the planet's material resources, its realization must lie in the study of man individually and collectively as a spiritual being, potentially capable of identifying himself with the whole universe.

Planetary Responsibility

In his article, "Universal Applications of Doctrine," William Q. Judge speaks of how Karma may be seen in every act of life:

> Bearing this in mind, we can confidently proceed to examine the great ideas in which so many of us believe, with a view of seeing how they may be applied in every direction. For if, instead of selfishly considering these laws in their effect upon our miserable selves we ask how they apply everywhere, a means is furnished for the broadening of our horizon and the elimination of selfishness. And when, also, we apply the doctrines to all our

acts and to all parts of the human being, we may begin to wake ourselves up to the real task set before us.

Let us look at Karma. It must be applied not only to the man, but also to the Cosmos, to the globe upon which he lives. You know that, for the want of an English word, the period of one great day of evolution is called a Manwantara, or the reign of one Manu. These eternally succeed each other. In other words, each one of us is a unit or a cell, if you please, in the great body or being of Manu, and just as we see ourselves making Karma and reincarnating for the purpose of carrying off Karma, so the great being Manu dies at the end of a Manwantara, and after a period of rest reincarnates once more, the sum total of all that we have made him—or it. And when I say "we," I mean all the beings on whatever plane or planet who are included in that Manwantara. Therefore, this Manwantara is just exactly what the last Manwantara made it, and so the next Manwantara after this—millions of years off—will be the sum or result of this one, plus all that have preceded it.

Theologian on Spiritualism

The Los Angeles *Times* (Nov. 15, 1971) reports the views of an Episcopal theologian on the possibility of communications from the dead. The Rev. Canon Geddes MacGregor is of the opinion that, although there is undoubtedly some kind of communication taking place, it is not likely to be from those who have departed this life. His reasons, which to Theosophists will have the ring of common sense, are similar to some of those offered by H. P. Blavatsky almost a century ago. Canon MacGregor said:

There is no reason, I suppose, to have a scintillating wit from outside. But still one must expect something more interesting than the banalities we most often hear.

One could expect more from a friend who had visited Paris—what might one anticipate from some one who has gone to a new kind of world? How anyone can go to another dimension and engage in talk so dull as to make our own talk look so lively is beyond me.

Although H.P.B. defended the authenticity of spiritualistic phenomena, she explained in numerous articles why the "spirits" involved in communications from the states beyond death could not be departed loved ones, but were denizens of the lower astral regions. The tragic history of mediums who have sunk into the most unsavory forms of debauchery and deception, not to mention cases of obsession among those who have participated in séances is testimony to the serious dangers of this form of psychism.